UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,816	05/01/2001	Phani Kumar Bidarahalli	390086.94715	5877

28382	7590	04/21/2004		EXAMINER	

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 2040
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497

EXAMINER
CHANG, ERIC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	2

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/846,816	Applicant(s) BIDARAHALLI ET AL.
	Examiner Eric Chang	Art Unit 2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 May 2001_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _01 May 2001_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21 are pending.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to because the arrows from decision block 168 in FIG. 7 lack

"Yes" and "No" labels. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   Claim 9 recites the limitation "system" in line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Windows95

Resource Kit" by Microsoft, in view of U.S. Patent 6,119,186 to Watts, et al.

6.   As to claim 1, Microsoft discloses a method for configuring a set of applications in a

computer system, the method comprising the steps of: receiving system user identifying

information [pages 482-483]; using the identifying information to determine the user's preferred

applications, and loading said applications [page 504]. Microsoft teaches storing a user's

preferred applications in a Custom Startup Folder, which are booted when the user starts a

session. The contents of the Custom Startup Folder are based on the user profile, which is

accessed when the user logs into the computer system, thereby entering user-identifying

information. Microsoft teaches all of the limitations of the claim, but does not teach determining

which preferred applications are already booted up, and booting the ones that are not already

booted.

        Watts teaches determining which of the preferred applications are already booted up, the

already booted up preferred applications being a first subset and the other preferred applications

being a second subset; and booting up the second subset of preferred applications [FIG. 9b and

col. 12, lines 49-57]. Watts teaches that a user's preferred applications are launched when an

environmental factor changes, such as when a new user uses the computer system [col. 7, lines

17-26], and applications that are already running are not launched, substantially as claimed.

        At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to employ the application launching means as taught by Watts. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to prevent duplicates of a preferred

application from being launched.

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of

the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of modifying the operation of a

computer system when the user of the system changes. Moreover, the application launching means taught by Watts would improve the flexibility of Microsoft because it allowed preferred applications to not only be launched when the user changes, but also when other environmental factors change.

7.   As to claims 2-3, 11-12 and 21, Watts discloses identifying non-preferred applications that are booted and disabling or turning off the non-preferred applications [col. 17, lines 61-67, and col. 18, lines 1-2]. Watts teaches modifying the configuration of the computer based on the optimal configuration for the user, including enabling user-preferred applications; it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the modification of the configuration could also comprise disabling non-user-preferred applications, in order to conserve system resources.

8.   As to claims 4 and 13, Microsoft discloses using a database including user-identifying information correlated with preferred applications and correlating the identifying information with the preferred applications [pages 504-505]. Microsoft teaches the preferred applications are stored in a database and correlated to a user profile, which is used when the user logs into the computer system.

9.   As to claims 5, Microsoft discloses providing at least one field for entering user identifying information on a display and, when information is provided via the field, retrieving the information therefrom [pages 482-483]. Microsoft teaches that a user logs into the operating

system, and the profile associated with said user is loaded; it is well known in the art that the

process of logging into a computer system comprises entering user identifying information.

10.   As to claims 6, 8, 14 and 16, Watts discloses at least one critical application is critical to

operation of at least one of the preferred applications and wherein the method further includes

the steps of, for each preferred application, determining if there are any critical applications

booting up all such critical applications [col. 12, lines 18-32]. Watts teaches that critical

applications, such as *.dll used by preferred applications, are automatically launched when said

preferred applications are launched. It would have further been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art that the process for launching the user preferred applications could likewise be applied

to such critical applications, because the process is directed to efficiently booting applications,

substantially as claimed.

11.   As to claims 7 and 15, Watts discloses configuring the user preferred applications by

providing an interface for receiving user information and preferences, receiving user preferences

and related user information via the interface and storing the user preferred applications

correlated with the user information for subsequent use [col. 15, lines 42-62]. Watts teaches a

customizing menu in order to receive user preferences and related information. In addition,

Microsoft teaches that user profile information is also stored for subsequent use [pages 482-483].

12.   As to claims 9 and 17, Watts discloses modifying the booted applications as a function of

detected operational status [col. 8, lines 5-13], and modifying the operation of booted

applications [col. 8, lines 20-27]. Because the processor usage is a function of the operational

status of the computer system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

disable booted applications in response to a processor usage threshold, substantially as claimed.

13.   As to claim 10, Microsoft and Watts disclose a method for configuring a set of

applications, comprising receiving system user identifying information; using the identifying

information to determine the user's preferred applications; determining which of the preferred

applications are already booted up, the already booted up preferred applications being a first

subset and the other preferred applications being a second subset; and booting up the second

subset of preferred preferences, substantially as claimed. Because Microsoft and Watts teach the

method, Microsoft and Watts teach a processor running a program to implement said method.

14.   As to claim 18, Microsoft discloses a method for configuring a set of applications in a

computer system, the method comprising the steps of: receiving system user identifying

information [pages 482-483]; using the identifying information to determine the user's preferred

applications; and loading said applications [page 504].

In addition, Watts teaches determining which of the preferred applications are already

booted up, the already booted up preferred applications being a first subset and the other

preferred applications being a second subset; booting up the second subset of preferred

applications [FIG. 9b and col. 12, lines 49-57]; identifying non-preferred applications that are

booted and disabling or turning off the non-preferred applications [col. 17, lines 61-67, and col.

18, lines 1-2]. Watts teaches modifying the configuration of the computer based on the optimal

configuration for the user, including enabling user-preferred applications; it would be obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art that the modification of the configuration could also comprise

disabling non-user-preferred applications, in order to conserve system resources.

15.   As to claim 19, Microsoft discloses a method for configuring a set of applications in a

computer system, the method comprising the steps of: receiving system user identifying

information [pages 482-483]; storing, correlating and using the identifying information to

determine the user's preferred applications; and loading said applications [page 504].

        In addition, Watts discloses at least one critical application is critical to operation of at

least one of the preferred applications and wherein the method further includes the steps of, for

each preferred application, determining if there are any critical applications booting up all such

critical applications [col. 12, lines 18-32]. Watts teaches that critical applications, such as *.dll

used by preferred applications, are automatically launched when said preferred applications are

launched. It would have further been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process

for launching the user preferred applications could likewise be applied to such critical

applications, because the process is directed to efficiently booting applications, substantially as

claimed.

16.   As to claim 20, Microsoft and Watts disclose a method for configuring a set of

applications, comprising receiving system user identifying information; using the identifying

information to determine the user's preferred applications; determining which of the preferred

applications are already booted up, the already booted up preferred applications being a first

subset and the other preferred applications being a second subset; and booting up the second

subset of preferred preferences, substantially as claimed. Because Microsoft and Watts teach the

method, Microsoft and Watts teach an apparatus implementing said method.

Conclusion

17.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Eric Chang whose telephone number is (703) 305-4612. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ec
April 5, 2004

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800 2100